

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

5
55
56
87

OCCASIONAL PAPERS
of
INSTITUTE FOR ANTIQUITY AND CHRISTIANITY



The Library
of the
School of Theology
at Claremont

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711

er
leil
on
nson
ers
nbush

copy-
y from
dies in
Press,
RS are
ianity,
ifornia
tiquity
nip are
LETIN

and OCCASIONAL PAPERS of the Institute for Antiquity
and Christianity for libraries is \$20.00. Individual copies
of this paper may be acquired from the Institute for the
prepaid fee of \$4.00 (includes \$2.00 for postage and
handling). This issue was produced and distributed in
April 1987.

Foreword

John Kloppenborg's impressively wide-ranging survey of the various genres of sayings collections in antiquity and his placing of Q within that context have elevated this dimension of the study of Q to a new niveau of sophistication. With its publication, all previous studies of the genre of Q are rendered inadequate, irrespective of how near or far they may have been from the truth. For they have sought to place Q on a very partial grid of alternatives, in contrast to the vast panorama, the carefully textured background, on the basis of which Q receives its profile in *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*.

The comparison of Kloppenborg's achievement with that of his predecessors seems so one-sided as to be hardly kind. Such a brief earlier study as that of Ernst Bammel,¹ to the effect that Q is to be considered a testament comparable to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, seems by comparison hardly worthy of discussion, based as it was on little more than a single and, at that, uncertain, Q saying, which is compared with but one segment of the Jewish background of Christianity. Such a study betrays the narrowness of vision that ignores the whole Hellenistic world, from Egypt to Greece to Babylonia to Persia, in which early Judaism and primitive Christianity were bathed, and in which Kloppenborg's study is thoroughly at home. Again, such a recent study as that of Robert Hodgson,² to the effect that Q belongs to the *testimonia* literature that has been sporadically assumed to lie behind primitive Christian literary production, a view that has been given added impetus by Qumranian *testimonia*-like texts, seems likewise to suffer from the limited scope surveyed in Hodgson's Heidelberg dissertation on *testimonia*. In the case of Q, such a study projects a cozy biblicism back upon the Q

1. Ernst Bammel, "Das Ende von Q," *Verborum Veritas: Festschrift für G. Stählin zum 70. Geburtstag* (Wuppertal: Rolf Brockhaus, 1970) 39-50.

2. Robert Hodgson, "On the Gattung of Q: A Dialogue with James M. Robinson," *Biblica* 66 (1985) 73-95.

community's much more uninhibited proclamation. In effect it makes the last stage of Q, characterized by the three Deuteronomic responses to the temptations, itself a worthy anticipation of the Gospel of Matthew's biblical erudition, the anachronistic model for reconstructing the sayings of Jesus and his original disciples. What Kloppenborg's presentation brings home again and again is that such limited approaches, even if the conclusions were nearer the truth than they happen to be in these cases, are simply methodologically unacceptable. Such whimsical, almost anecdotal approaches, even if by accident they were to fall on the right conclusion, would not deserve to be right!

A somewhat more awkward comparison would have to do with my own article of a generation ago, "LOGOI SOPHON: On the *Gattung* of Q."³ There I broke with the prevalent critical view of the *Gospel of Thomas*, commonly held to be a gnosticizing reduction of the canonical Gospels into a haphazard scattering of sayings worthy of the Gnostic redeemer, who saves not by his saving work but only through the gnosis latent in his word. Yet it had been the anti-Bultmannian forces, represented by such prestigious names as Oscar Cullmann and Gilles Quispel, who had argued that the *Gospel of Thomas* was primarily to be understood not as a reduction of the canonical Gospels but as based on noncanonical gospels. I surely had no interest to aid and abet such an approach, with its disinterest in the genre question and its conservative bias.

What had actually triggered my essay was the view bluntly expressed by Werner Georg Kümmel, to the effect that the genre of the *Gospel of Thomas*, whatever it might be, had absolutely nothing to do with Q. Thus my motivation was not to strengthen a correlation of the *Gospel of Thomas* with lost apocryphal gospels, about which hardly more was known than their titles and a very few sayings shared with the *Gospel of Thomas*. For it seemed a moot question whether one text was dependent on the other, and if so which on which, or whether the texts were independent of each other but shared a dependence on oral tradition. Hence to designate such lost apocryphal gospels or even Q as "sources" of the *Gospel of Thomas* seemed uncritical. Rather I had in view a form-critical trajectory which Q and the *Gospel of Thomas* might share. This working hypothesis was based on their strikingly similar divergence

3. James M. Robinson, "LOGOI SOPHON: On the *Gattung* of Q," *The Future of Our Religious Past: Essays in Honor of Rudolf Bultmann* (ed. James M. Robinson; New York/Evanston/San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1971) 84-130; repr. *Trajectories Through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971) 71-113.

from what one normally expects of a gospel: a narrative text in which some sayings are embedded, culminating in the passion narrative and Easter, oriented to the kerygma of cross and resurrection as *the* Christian message. There must be *some* historical explanation for this deficiency shared by Q and the *Gospel of Thomas*, a deficiency that seems related to the problem of defining the gospel as a literary genre. But I never actually worked through this working hypothesis.

To put the matter a bit baldly, my article was at the time conceived of as one chapter of a book on Q that was never written—one of several casualties resulting from my being trapped into a sudden career shift, motivated by fear that the Nag Hammadi texts, with whatever relevance they might have beyond the *Gospel of Thomas* for such matters, would not become accessible during my lifetime. By the time I completed in 1984 *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*, I had settled upon Q as the area where I proposed to work myself back into New Testament scholarship in the traditional sense of the term. I was not only motivated by the central position of Q in any assessment of primitive Christianity, in spite of its almost complete neglect in the Bultmannian synthesis. I was also impressed by the many creative monographs on Q that had appeared in the post-Bultmannian period, which had catapulted this area of research onto a completely new level after a half century of neglect. The whole topic of Q seemed ready for plucking. I decided to devote a major part of my career from now on to reconstructing a critical text of Q and producing a commentary on that text, both for the Hermeneia series.

I first read *The Formation of Q* in typescript at this critical juncture in my own career, and experienced it as a fine confirmation of this sense of the times. Indeed it seemed to me to compensate in large part for the two decades I had lost in my own New Testament scholarship relevant to Q, between the article "LOGOI SOPHON" of 1964, and the plan of 1984 to return to Q studies. In fact my relation to *The Formation of Q* was much like the compliment one occasionally finds in book reviews: it is the kind of book I would like to have written. For Kloppenborg's much more detailed analysis of the kinds of sayings collections in antiquity did not just rubber-stamp my conclusions, much less validate my limited methodological scope. Rather it improved upon what I had to say in my premature article, as well as providing the equivalent of the rest of the chapters of the nonexistent book. Thus I can to a very large degree identify with the book and even claim its conclusions as mine, in the sense that I think my position would have modulated into much the

same as that of the book, had I taken the time to carry out such careful and extensive research. Thus I can only welcome it at this quite personal level as the kind of follow-through by a junior colleague that I have learned to accept with satisfaction, when I have launched a working hypothesis that I have not found time to work through to definitive conclusions.

It is with such a mixture of objective academic assessments and personal feelings of identification that I read this book in typescript, recommended its inclusion in the Institute's recently launched Studies in Antiquity and Christianity, and here commend it to the reading public as a landmark in the study of Q. My own future work on Q will be advanced considerably by the materials and conclusions that Kloppenborg presents here. And I look forward to comparable assistance from the continuing research on Q in which Kloppenborg, as a member of the Institute's Q Project, the Society of Biblical Literature's Q Seminar, and Robert W. Funk's Jesus Seminar, is currently quite actively engaged.

JAMES M. ROBINSON, *Director*

Institute for Antiquity and Christianity
Claremont, California

The Composition of Q

THE STRUCTURE AND UNITY OF Q

The Synoptic Sayings Source is not, as is sometimes thought, a "random collection of sayings" but manifests a variety of types of literary organization.¹ Not only are the sayings grouped into several topically coherent clusters; there is also a measure of unity and coherence among the several clusters as well as logical and thematic development throughout the course of the entire collection.

That Q has been viewed as a primitive or inferior literary product is not, of course, surprising. When placed alongside the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, both of which employ narrative as a framing device, Q seems deficient. But this is to compare apples and oranges. In fact, I will argue in chapter seven that when placed with its real literary family, namely, that of sapiential instructions, gnomologia and chriae collection, the Synoptic Sayings Source ranks with the most sophisticated literary products of its class.

The fact that the caricature of Q as a random collection of sayings could commend itself betrays significant historical and sociological assumptions about the nature of early Christianity. To those like Harnack who sought in Q an unimpeachable source for the consciousness of the Jesus of history, the denial of significant editorial intervention by the compilers of Q was essential. Q could not reflect strongly the literary and theological interests of its tradents and compilers if it was to reflect the historical Jesus. But even for those who, following Wellhausen's critique of Harnack's historical over-assessment of Q, found in it an expression of the earliest post-Easter Palestinian church, the assumption came easy

1. Schürmann, ("Reminiszenzen," 111) has criticized the use of the term *Logienquelle* and advocated *Redequelle* on the grounds that Q consists not in a collection of individual sayings, but in several "complexes of speeches." Koester ("Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels," 112) also rejects the designation "random collection of sayings."

that Q's lack of literary finesse was consistent with *anthropoi agrammatoi kai idiotai* who transmitted and used it. But have we been misled by a romantic notion of the constitution of earliest Christianity? Were the first purveyors of the Jesus tradition really so "primitive"? Recent investigation of other early Christian documents has challenged such a view, and social analysis of early Christian groups suggests that the Jesus movement has significant numbers of adherents from the "middle classes." The very fact that Q was *written* and not simply a set of oral folk sayings of a pre-literate group is evidence of use by Christians with access to literary technology.

Topical Groupings

What types of literary organization does Q exhibit? Perhaps the most obvious form is *topical*. Sayings are not simply strung together but gathered into coherent groupings. Some sayings are juxtaposed on the basis of formal similarities, e.g., four beatitudes in 6:20b-23 or seven woes in 11:39-52. Other clusters cohere thematically (e.g., 11:2-4, 9-13: on prayer). And these smaller compositions in turn combine to produce larger structural groupings.

Various attempts have been made to articulate the overall structure of Q. T. W. Manson proposed a fourfold division of Q:²

- | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Q 3:7-7:35 | John the Baptist and Jesus |
| b. Q 9:57-11:13 | Jesus and his disciples |
| c. Q 11:14-12:34 | Jesus and his opponents |
| d. Q 12:35-17:37 | The future |

Drawing on Jacobson's treatment of Q, Crossan proposes a similar division:³

- | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| a. Q 3:1-7:35 | Jesus and John |
| b. Q 9:57-11:13 | Jesus and disciples |
| c. Q 11:14-51 | Jesus and opponents |
| d. Q 12:2-22:30 | Jesus and apocalypse |

The appropriateness of these headings may be questioned. There is much in 3:7-7:35 that has nothing at all to do with John the Baptist and his relation with Jesus (namely, 6:20b-49; 7:1-10). Manson's third section (11:14-12:34) is not solely concerned with opponents, but contains

2. Manson, *Sayings*, 39-148.

3. Crossan, *In Fragments*, 156, 342-45; Arland D. Jacobson, "Wisdom Christology in Q."

hortatory words directed at the community (12:2-7, 11-12, 22-31). And Crossan's fourth section (12:2-20:30) contains not only apocalyptic words, but sapiential admonitions, parables and discipleship sayings.

The division of Q into smaller thematically organized units avoids some of the inexactitudes of the above classifications. Both Polag and Schenk use more headings although neither their respective divisions nor their headings correspond exactly:⁴

<i>Q Text</i>	<i>Polag</i>	<i>Schenk</i>
Q 3:7-9, 16-17	A. Exordium	1. Prologue: John the Precursor
Q 4:1-13		2. Introductory portrait of Jesus
Q 6:20b-49	B. Sermo in monte	3. Statement of principles
Q 7:1-10		4. Paradigm: Jesus' first Gentile follower
Q 7:18-35	C. Johannes Baptista	5. On the Baptist
Q 9:57-62	D. Missio discipulorum	6. Prologue of the commissioning Speech
Q 10:2-24		7. The commissioning Speech
Q 11:2-4, 9-13	E. De oratione	8. On prayer
Q 11:14-35	F. Contentiones	9. Controversy: the Beelzebul accusation and request for a sign
Q 11:39-52		10. Controversy: contemporary Jewish piety
Q 12:2-12	G. De confessione	11. On the church
Q 12:22-34	H. De sollicitudinibus et vigilantia	
Q 12:39-53		12. The first eschatological speech
Q 12:54-13:21	I. Parabolae ac diversae sententiae	
Q 13:23-16:18		13. The two ways
Q 17:1-6	K. De responsabilitate discipulorum	
Q 17:23-22:30	L. De iudicio	14. The second and concluding eschatological speech

Most of the disagreements between Polag and Schenk are minor. Schenk proposes finer divisions, for example, separating Polag's section "Missio discipulorum" (D) into two sections (##6, 7), and "Contentiones" (F) into two controversies (##9, 10). In my view it is preferable to treat 7:1-10, which puts Israel in an unflattering light, along with 7:18-35 rather than including it with the Sermon on the Mount (thus Polag).

4. Polag, *Fragmenta*, 23-26; Schenk, *Synopse*, 5-9.

This produces a unit which is bracketed by criticism of the lack of response of Israel to Jesus (7:9, 31-35). Contrary to Schenk, 13:18-19 and 13:20-21 (two parables of growth) do not fit well with 12:39-59; but neither do they cohere with the following materials. They are best left on their own. While 13:23-14:34 may be appropriately termed a "two ways" speech, the material in 15:3-16:18 is not so readily classifiable.

Disagreement about this or that outline of the contents of Q is hardly avoidable.⁵ But at the same time it is clear that the Q sayings have been organized thoughtfully into topical groupings. For the purpose of my analysis, I propose the following heuristic division of Q. Detailed rationale for these divisions and an exposition of the structural principles governing the composition of each unit will be provided in chapters four and five.

1. John's preaching of the Coming One	Q 3:7-9, 16-17
2. The temptation of Jesus	Q 4:1-13
3. Jesus' inaugural Sermon	Q 6:20b-49
4. John, Jesus and "this generation"	Q 7:110, 18-28; (16:16); 7:31-35
5. Discipleship and mission	Q 9:57-62; 10:224
6. On prayer	Q 11:2-4, 9-13
7. Controversies with Israel	Q 11:14-52
8. On fearless preaching	Q 12:2-12
9. On anxiety over material needs	Q 12:(13-14, 16-21), 22-31, 33-34
10. Preparedness for the end	Q 12:39-59
11. Two parables of growth	Q 13:18-19, 20-21
12. The two ways	Q 13:24-30, 34-35; 14:16-24, 26-27; 17:33; 14:33-34
13. Various parables and sayings	Q 15:3-7; 16:13, 17-18; 17:1-6
14. The eschatological discourse	Q 17:23-37; 19:12-19; 22:28-30

Thematic Unity of Q

That there is topical organization of various sub-sets of Q sayings is evident. But what can be said of the collection as a whole? Examination of the contents of Q reveals that there are several basic unifying motifs which elevate Q beyond a mere agglomeration of sayings and smaller sayings collections.

Arland Jacobson has recently demonstrated a large measure of thematic unity within the Q materials.⁶ Q, he argues, stands within a

5. The definition of Q adopted here includes all of those pericopae listed in table 3 (above, pp. 000-000) supplemented by Luke 9:61-62 and 12:13-14, 16b-21.

6. Jacobson, "Literary Unity," 365-89.

prophetic tradition pervaded by deuteronomistic theology. According to this theology,

Israel's history is pictured as a history of disobedience. God in his forbearance sent warning to the people through the prophets, yet they rejected and even killed the prophets. Therefore God's wrath was—or will be—experienced. References to the prophets are a recurring but not a constant element in the deuteronomistic tradition; the rejection of the prophets is cited as simply one indication of the stiff-neckedness of the people. Certain distortions of history are conventional: the prophets appear almost exclusively in the role of preachers of repentance; far more prophets are killed than actually were; there is a tendency to expand the list of prophets . . . It is noteworthy that the guilt of the fathers is said to remain even up to the present (Ezra 9:7; Neh 1:6; Ps 78:8; cf. Luke 11:49–51 par). The primary concern of the tradition is to call for Israel to return to Yahweh.⁷

Jacobson detects the motif of persistent disobedience in Q 6:23c, 11:47–51; 13:34–35; and 14:16–24. Likewise, Q refers to God's continual sending of the prophets (11:47–51; 13:34–35; 14:16–24) and Israel's continual rejection of them (6:23c; 11:47–51; 13:34–35; 14:16–24). Examples of Gentile faith further expose Israel's impenitence (7:1–10; 10:13–15; 11:31–32), an impenitence which will be punished by the coming wrath (3:16–17; 11:47–51; 13:34–35). Q contains the new call to repentance (3:7–9, 16–17; 6:20–49; 7:31–35; 10:2–12; 11:29–32; 11:39–52) and the threat of rejection for those who reject this final call (10:10–12, 13–15, 16; 12:10).⁸

It will be noticed that deuteronomistic influence is in fact restricted to a relatively few passages; large portions of Q (including 6:20b–49 and 10:2–12, 16, notwithstanding Jacobson's attempt to label either a "call to repentance") lack this motif. Nevertheless, Jacobson's observations are of utmost significance since they are coupled with a redaction-critical judgment that this theology dominated one stage of Q redaction.⁹ Hence, although he has not attempted to prove that deuteronomistic theology pervades the whole of Q, Jacobson successfully demonstrates that at one point in its literary evolution, Q was organized and redacted from a coherent theological perspective. This redaction lends to the collection an important unity.¹⁰

7. Jacobson, "Literary Unity," 384. Jacobson depends here upon Steck, *Israel*, *passim*.

8. Jacobson, "Literary Unity," 384–85.

9. *Ibid.*, 388–89; *idem*, "Wisdom Christology," *passim*.

10. Additionally, Jacobson asserts the unity of Q on form-critical grounds, observing that in comparison with Mark, Q contains a relatively large number of beatitudes, woes, "eschatological correlatives" and prophetic threats (Mark has only three, all duplicated in Q). Conversely, Q contains very few controversies and miracle stories. The controversies present in Q do not touch on legal matters as they do in Mark, and the

Logical and Qualitative Progression in Q

In his socio-rhetorical analysis of Mark, Vernon Robbins describes Mark's art of persuasion.¹¹ Drawing on the work of Kenneth Burke, Robbins distinguishes two ways in which Mark's narrative is advanced: by "logical form," that is, "the form of a perfectly conducted argument, advancing step by step," and by "qualitative form," in which "the presence of one quality prepares us for the introduction of another."¹² In Mark, logical progressions occur as "Jesus, the narrator, or others make promises that begin to be fulfilled, or when they make assertions or give explanations that anticipate or suggest later events."¹³ On the other hand, the appropriateness of some developments are seen only in retrospect: that Jesus heals, exorcises and calls disciples follows, though not in a syllogistic way, from his designation as "the stronger one" (Mark 1:7).¹⁴ This is qualitative progression. Although Q lacks Mark's overarching narrative framework, it too manifests logical and qualitative progressions.

The collection opens with John's prediction of the imminent appearance of the Coming One (3:16-17), thereby raising in the audience the expectation of fulfilment. This in fact occurs in 7:18-23 where Jesus is expressly identified with the Coming One. Yet ambiguities persist, since John's Coming One is not obviously consistent with Jesus as he is described in 7:22-23. How is the miracle-worker of 7:22 who points to the presence of the kingdom equivalent to John's coming apocalyptic judge? But this is not the end of it. The title emerges a third time, now in a context (13:25-30, 34-35) which is replete with the motifs of apocalyptic judgment: the Coming One of Q 13:34-35 acquires again the ominous connotations and strongly futuristic orientation of John's figure. Hence this particular logical progression begins and ends in the idiom of apocalypticism, but makes a theological detour in which the motif of the presence of the eschaton in Jesus' activity comes to the fore.

miracle stories are strongly oriented to the sayings component, not to the miraculous as such. Such form-critical observations are much less telling than his comments on thematic unity. While in comparison with Mark, Q displays a distinctive profile of sayings types, it must not be forgotten that Mark is unified above all by a narrative framework which Q lacks. When compared with other speech and saying collections from antiquity, it is immediately apparent that Q contains a relatively wider range of sayings types than these other collections. That is, Q is relatively less unified *formally* than comparable collections.

11. Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*.

12. Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, 9; Kenneth Burke, *Counter-Statement* (2d ed.; Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1968) esp. 123-83.

13. Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, 77.

14. *Ibid.*, 85.

Qualitative progression occurs in Q's use of the theme of judgment. Q opens with the spectre of a baptizing ascetic proclaiming the imminent judgment of God and the demand for repentance (3:7-9, 16-17). At first blush, there seems to be little affinity between this figure and Jesus. In the description of the appearance of Jesus in Q 4:1-13 and in his first pronouncements (6:20b-49) the motifs of judgment and repentance are largely absent. Jesus' comportment, even as an itinerant preacher (Q 9:58), is in sharp contrast with the austerity of John's appearance. Despite Jesus' brief visit to the desert (4:1-13), his life is lived in constant interaction with populated areas and his followers preach in the towns and villages (Q 10:4-11), not on the fringes of civilization. Itinerancy is the spatial concept which belongs to Jesus' relationship with others; pilgrimage is John's. However, the motifs which characterized John's preaching soon emerge in Q, figuring prominently in Jesus' own preaching (10:12, 13-15; 11:31-32; 49-51; 12:8-9; 13:28-29; 34-35). Moreover, Q includes a sequence (7:24-28, 31-35) which asserts programmatically the fundamental agreement of John and Jesus and thereby serves to effect a transition between their two ministries. The effect of such a qualitative progression is to affirm rhetorically the commonality which exists between two figures who, as Q 7:33-34 expresses well, were quite different.

A related qualitative progression pertains to Jesus' disciples. The verses which most probably concluded Q (22:28-30) promise that the followers of Jesus will themselves dispense the judgment which Jesus and John threatened over Israel. This pericope and Q 10:16 ("the one who listens to you listens to me, and the one who rejects you rejects me . . .") establish a continuity between the activity of Jesus and that of his followers. With these qualitative progressions the compiler of Q seeks to assert the basic coherence between the activities of John, Jesus and his followers, and to underline the importance of the announcement of judgment and the call to repentance. While Q lacks a unifying narrative format, these instances of logical and qualitative progression lend the collection a significant measure of logical and structural coherence.

THE REDACTIONAL ANALYSIS OF Q

To affirm that the final form of Q reveals some degree of structural and thematic coherence does not answer all of the questions that we may have. I have already noted that the deuteronomistic motif, which Jacobson has properly identified as fundamental to one stage of Q

redaction, does not appear in significant portions of Q. This raises the question, Is it the deuteronomistic motif of the preaching of repentance to Israel which was formative for Q as a literary work? Or is this motif characteristic of a second level of redaction and expansion? The varying assessments of the nature of Q by Robinson and Koester on the one hand, and Kelber and Boring on the other, also demand some resolution. There can be no doubt that Q contains both sapiential and prophetic forms. But what is the relationship between these two types of sayings forms? It is possible at least that the sapiential statements have been fully co-opted into a prophetic genre to the extent that Q presents itself not as a wisdom book, but as an oracle collection. Alternatively, Wisdom's speech in Prov 8 affords an example of the incorporation of the motif of the prophet's call to repentance into a sapiential context. Do the various elements within Q interact in one of these ways? It is also possible that, as Koester has intimated, Q has experienced a shift in its generic trajectory, beginning in one genre and experiencing a transformation through redactional intervention.

What is called for is a method of analysis which permits us to see the literary and theological principles which informed the composition of individual clusters of Q sayings, and the association of those clusters into a literary whole. Such a method of analysis should allow us to distinguish the redaction of smaller collections which eventually found their way into Q, or earlier, formative recensions of Q, from the theological and literary perspective of the final edition.

Methodological Considerations

In the past a variety of analytic methods have been employed in the discussion of the composition of Q, not all of them entirely successful. Since I have discussed the history of such attempts in another place,¹⁵ I shall not rehearse this here. One point, however, is important. For the analysis of Q *as a document*, neither a form-critical nor a purely tradition-historical method is adequate. The compositional history of Q cannot be reduced to the various histories of its component forms. On the other hand, the redaction-critical methods which have proved effective in the analysis of Mark and which depend on the isolation of "seams" and "summary statements" and on the analysis of narrative movements are not readily transferable to the study of Q.

15. Kloppenborg, "Tradition and Redaction," 34-62.

The most satisfactory models for redactional analysis of Q have been offered by Dieter Lührmann and Arland Jacobson.¹⁶ Redactional intention, Lührmann writes, becomes visible in three ways: (a) in the principles of association of form-critically independent units; (b) in the comparison of Q and Mark in those instances of Mark-Q overlap and (c) in the *Gemeindebildungen* which may be ascribed to the Q redactor or to that stratum of tradition from which the redaction was born.¹⁷ When a particular theme occurs in several complexes of sayings, or is evident in several Mark-Q overlaps, or is dominant in the Q *Gemeindebildungen*, then it may justifiably be considered redactional.

One caution is appropriate here. In the Q materials, it is notoriously difficult to distinguish sayings which are the creation of the Q redactor from "community constructions." In fact the term "community construction" belongs more properly to the vocabulary of form criticism than to redaction criticism and it implies, rather tendentiously, a creativity on the part of the community *per se*. For redactional purposes, it would be wiser to distinguish a redactor's addition of a free-floating saying (whatever its origin) from his creation of material which frames, joins or comments upon the sayings he has inherited. In most cases it is virtually impossible to determine whether a particular saying is a creation of a redactor or whether it is simply a piece of tradition which was deemed appropriate for inclusion because it resonated with the interests of the redactor and his community. For these reasons, Lührmann's *Gemeindebildungen* cannot be controlled sufficiently to act as a secure basis for determining redaction history and should not be employed as he attempts to employ them.

Jacobson's criteria for determining redaction are quite similar to Lührmann's. He finds evidence of insertions and additions in "grammatical shifts, breaks in the train of thought, shifts in audience, shifts in tradition or theology"¹⁸ —generally speaking, in aporiae created by redactional activity. In the second place, Jacobson, like Lührmann, considers the principles which govern the juxtaposition of formcritically independent units. Compositional analysis, as Jacobson calls his method, consists of identifying redactional insertions and the principles which control the construction of larger units within Q. It yields a profile of what from a literary perspective is primary and what is secondary in particular pericopae or series of pericopae. Working synthetically, Jacob-

16. Lührmann, *Redaktion*; Jacobson, "Wisdom Christology."

17. Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 20-22.

18. Jacobson, "Wisdom Christology," 9.

son constructs several redactional phases, each having a coherent set of characteristics. Unlike Lührmann, who detects only a single redaction, Jacobson posits three successive redactions: the initial compilation ("the compositional stage"), followed by an intermediate and a final redaction.¹⁹

In broad agreement with Lührmann and Jacobson, Dieter Zeller has recently outlined criteria for the detection of Q redaction.²⁰ To begin with, redaction may be seen in the interpretive expansions of individual sayings. But one caveat is necessary here: to the extent that it is possible, one must distinguish between expansions made while the sayings circulated orally and those which were made during the written stage. Only the latter are important for determining Q redaction. Second, as for Lührmann and Jacobson, the juxtaposition of originally independent units provides a key to editorial intention. And finally, Mark-Q comparison provides an additional criterion by which Q redaction can be set into relief.

The method which this study will adopt is similar to those employed by Lührmann, Jacobson and Zeller. The first analytic tool is the determination of the compositional principles which guide the juxtaposition of originally independent sayings and groups of sayings. Naturally this presupposes and builds upon the results from form-critical analysis. Once the component units within a Q section have been ascertained, the order in which sayings were added to one another and the method by which the association was accomplished (e.g., catchword, thematic formal association or syntactical connective) can be determined.

Of course, one cannot assume that the compositional themes governing one Q section were those of the final redactor. It is entirely possible that several smaller compilations—each governed by a particular redactional interest—were assembled by a final redactor who had entirely different interests. Hence it is necessary to coordinate the results of the analyses of several Q sections and endeavor to reconstruct one or more redactional stages, each having a coherent set of thematic, tradition-

19. To the final stage Jacobson assigns only the temptation account ("Wisdom Christology," 36-46). Since this constitutes an anti-enthusiastic polemic (*sic*) directed at other elements within Q, Jacobson allocates another set of redactional pericopae (3:16; 7:18-23, 28; 10:21-22; 11:2-4, 9-13; 17:5-6)—some of which manifest "enthusiastic tendencies"—to the penultimate (intermediate) redaction (pp. 218-22). To the compositional phase belong 3:8b; 6:23c, 39, 42; 7:1-10, 31-35; 16:16; 9:57-62; 10:2-12, 13-15, 16; 11:14-20, 23, 24-26, 29-32, 33-36, 49-51 and 13:34-35 (apparently).

20. Zeller, "Redaktionsprozesse," 396-99.

historical and perhaps form critical characteristics, and further, to stratify the redactional phases with respect to each other.

Second, redactional or compositional activity may be seen in insertions and glosses. These may be of several types. Some may be new creations of a redactor, either formations by analogy (*Analogiebildungen*) or some other secondary expansion. Others are more properly termed "commentary words" (*Kommentarworte*), i.e., originally independent sayings used to explain or modify another saying or groups of sayings.²¹ What is especially significant here is that we are dealing with materials which are secondary from a compositional perspective, irrespective of their age or ultimate provenance. Such insertions afford us a tool by which to stratify successive redactions of Q. For example, if the group of sayings "A," displaying a coherent set of formal and material characteristics and resembling other Q compositions, has been modified by the insertion of a secondary expansion or commentary word displaying a theology or style characteristic of a set of glosses or compositions elsewhere in Q ("B"), then we may assume that the "A" compilation or redaction is antecedent to the "B" redaction.

Naturally it is also possible that particular commentary words or secondary glosses were added at the oral stage or very early in the pre-history of Q. Schürmann, for example, has argued that the Son of Man saying in Q 11:30 was added to 11:29 prior to the addition of 11:31-32, and prior to the composition of the larger complex consisting of 11:14-26 + 11:29-32 + 11:33-36.²² In such a case the theological content of the commentary word or secondary expansion does not contribute to the understanding of Q redaction.²³

21. Bultmann's discussion of the various kinds of expansions is seminal here (see *Tradition*, 81-108 [84-113]). See further Wanke, "Kommentarworte," 208-33; idem, "Bezugs- und Kommentarworte" in *den synoptischen Evangelien* (Erfurter Theologische Studien 44; Leipzig: Benno, 1981).

22. Schürmann, "Menschensohn-Titel," 134.

23. Schürmann ("Menschensohn-Titel," 124-47) observes that all of the Q Son of Man sayings function as interpretations of other sayings, or small clusters of sayings. But they do not modify the more extensive Q-compositions. "That means two things: on the one hand, that the Son of Man title probably does not belong to the earliest stratum of the sayings-tradition, . . . and on the other, that Son of Man Christology is probably no longer the fundamental and leading christology of the final redaction of Q . . ." (pp. 146-47; trans. by auth.) In a more recent article, "Basileia Verkündigung" Schürmann analyzes the Kingdom sayings using a similar method. He assumes a progressive development of Q, (a) from individual sayings (*Grundworte*) which were augmented by commentary words or other expansions (*Zusatzworte*), (b) to *Spruchreihen*—i.e., series of *Grundworte* with their expansions—connected connected by catchword or thematic association—, (c) to *frühe Kompositionen*—sayings and series of sayings arranged under thematic perspectives and presented as speeches of Jesus—, (d) to the final collection of finished speeches. Schürmann also allows that the final redaction did not simply collect

Finally, as Lührmann has noted, comparison of Q with other streams of tradition—principally Mark—is a means by which to corroborate the conclusions obtained from the analysis of the compositional principles governing Q speeches and from the analysis of insertions and glosses. Strictly speaking, the Mark-Q comparison yields information only about the general tendency of the Q stream of *tradition*, not Q redaction as such. If, however, the manifest *Tendenz* of the Q version of a doublet coheres with the theology of one of the redactional levels identified from the analyses of compositional principles and insertions, then such a pericope could legitimately be included in that redactional phase.²⁴

The Analysis of Sayings Groups in Q

The method which we have proposed for the redactional analysis of Q focuses primarily upon the redactional principles governing clusters of sayings, and the motive informing the interpolation of glosses into pre-existing speeches. There is one limitation to this method: it is not particularly helpful for examining those sayings whose position in Q cannot be determined with certainty, or those sayings which are not obviously part of a larger complex of sayings. Examples of the latter are 17:1-4, 5-6 (the sayings on scandal), 15:4-7 (the parable of the lost sheep) and 16:13 (serving two masters). In these cases it is virtually impossible to decide on *literary* grounds whether a saying or parable is a *Grundwort*—to use Schürmann's term²⁵—or a commentary word, or whether it is formative or secondary. On material and thematic grounds, some of these sayings may be able to be placed, but this is only possible once a profile of the redactional strata of Q has been assembled from an analysis of the larger complexes of sayings.

Of the clusters of Q texts enumerated above, the most suitable for compositional analysis are

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. John's preaching of the Coming One | Q 3:7-9, 16-17 |
| 3. Jesus' inaugural sermon | Q 6:20b-49 |
| 4. John, Jesus and 'this generation' | Q 7:110, 18-28; (16:16); 7:31-35 |
| 5. Discipleship and mission | Q 9:57-62; 10:2-24 |
| 6. On prayer | Q 11:2-4, 9-13 |

and arrange the *frühe Kompositionen* but may also have inserted additional *Grundworte* and *Spruchreihen*.

24. Schenk (*Synopse*) proposes a lengthy list of redactional passages in Q, but since he provides no rationale, it is difficult to consider his suggestions in this survey of redactioncritical methods. On this see Neiryneck, "Study of Q."

25. Schürmann, "Basileia-Verkündigung," 128.

7. Controversies with Israel	Q 11:14-52
8. On fearless preaching	Q 12:2-12
9. On anxiety over material needs	Q 12:(13-14, 16-21), 22-31, 33-34
10. Preparedness for the end	Q 12:39-59
12. The two ways	Q 13:24-30, 34-35; 14:16-24; 14:26-27, 17:33; 14:33-34
14. The eschatological discourse	Q 17:23-37; 19:12-19; 22:28-30

As both Lührmann and Jacobson have seen, several of these complexes appear to be organized about the motifs of the coming judgment, the urgency of repentance, the impenitence of "this generation" and the ramifications of Gentile faith: #1 (3:7-9, 16-17); #4 (7:1-10, 18-35); #7 (11:14-52); #10 (12:39-59); and #14 (17:23-37). Since it is the motif of judgment which emerges prominently in the logical and qualitative forms which unify the collection as a whole, it is with these speeches that we shall begin (chapter four). In chapter five we shall turn to several other clusters of sayings which appear to be organized along entirely different lines, and which in general lack the motif of judgment and the call to repentance: #3 (6:20b-49); #5 (9:57-62 + 10:2-16, 21-24); #6 (11:2-4, 9-13); #8 (12:2-12); and #9 (12:22-34). In treating these speeches together we do not, of course, preclude the possibility that they may contain interpolations made from another perspective. Q 13:24-30, (34-35?) + 14:16-24, 26-27, 34-35 is a rather mixed speech, but will be considered here too. The temptation account (#2), which differs markedly from the rest of the Q materials in form and function, will be treated last (chapter six).

A055193
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.